



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 09/955,361 | 09/18/2001 | Fuad Rashid | M-11649 US | 9514 |
| 60975 7590 04/06/2007 CSA LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759 | | | EXAMINER STORK, KYLE R | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2178 | |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 04/06/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/955,361 | Applicant(s) RASHID ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Kyle R. Stork | Art Unit 2178 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the remarks filed 2 March 2007.
2. Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-77 are pending. Claims 1, 20, 39, 58, and 77 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 30, 33, 39, 49, 52, 58, 68, and 72 ^{also contain} are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack et al. (US 2002/0054115, filed 11 June 2001, hereafter Mack) and further in view of Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide (Adobe, 2000, hereafter Adobe), and further in view of Hall (Core Servlets and JavaServer Pages™, Prentice Hall, 2000).

As per independent claim 1, Mack discloses a method comprising:

- Migrating a Cartesian coordinate-based view to the tag field-based view, wherein the migration comprises:
 - Identifying a first applet of the one or more applets wherein the first applet comprises one or more controls (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, a Java applet is identified to be converted to XML)

- Associating a first applet template with the first applet, wherein the first applet template comprises one or more characteristics of each of the one or more controls (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, twin servlets acts as templates, converting Java applets to XML, and conversely, converting XML back to Java applets)
- Linking the first applet template to a corresponding first Cartesian view applet in the Cartesian coordinate-based view, wherein the first Cartesian view applet comprises a Cartesian view control (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, the operating buttons are in a Cartesian view (standard x-y coordinate space))
- Mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag field-based view (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024)

Mack fails to specifically disclose modifying the Cartesian view control to produce a corresponding tag view control, wherein said modifying matches characteristics of an associated control of the one or more controls in the first template. However, Adobe discloses adding control buttons to tag-based view (pages 306-307). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack's method of converting applets to tag-based views with Adobe's method of adding control buttons to a tag-based view, since it would have allowed a user to interact with the tag-based data (Adobe: page 306).

Mack fails to disclose selecting a tag field-based view comprising one or more applets. However, Adobe discloses selection of a tag-based view for displaying HTML

(page 62: Here, the HTML Source Editor tab allows a user to view and edit the HTML of a document, with HTML being a tab-based language). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe, since it would have allowed a user to directly edit HTML source code (Adobe: page 62).

Hall discloses HTML containing one or more applets (pages 274-283: Here, applets are embedded within an HTML document, which is a tag field-based language). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hall with Mack, since it would have allowed a user easily embed applet code within a tag based-field document (Hall: page 275).

As per dependent claim 11, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose adding controls to suit a user's needs. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be added to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add controls to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

As per dependent claim 14, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose deleting controls to suit a user's needs. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be deleted from a template to remove excess capabilities from a template to suit a user's

Art Unit: 2178

needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to remove controls from a template to tailor the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

As per independent claims 20, 39, 58, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 20, 39, and 58 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 30, 49, 68, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11. Claims 30, 49, and 68 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 33, 52, 71, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 14. Claims 33, 52, and 71 are similarly rejected.

5. Claims 3-4, 12-13, 15-16, 22-23, 31-32, 34-35, 41-42, 50-51, 53-54, 60-61, 69-70, and 72-73 ^{are} ~~are~~ rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Ladd (Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2, 1999, Que, Platinum Edition, Page 1004, hereinafter Ladd).

As per dependent claim 3, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose a field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one field control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at least one field control because fields accept user input from the keyboard.

As per dependent claim 4, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to

Art Unit: 2178

specifically disclose a non-field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one non-field control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at least one non-field control because non-field controls constrain user input.

As per dependent claims 12, 15, 22, 31, 34, 41, 50, 53, 60, 69, and 72 the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 12, 15, 22, 31, 34, 41, 50, 53, 60, 69, and 72 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 13, 16, 23, 32, 35, 42, 51, 54, 61, 70, and 73 the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 13, 16, 23, 32, 35, 42, 51, 54, 61, 70, and 73 are similarly rejected.

6. Claims 5, 24, 43, and 62 ^{or remain} ~~are~~ rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Watters (USPN 5,897,645—filing date 11/22/1996).

As per dependent claim 5, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose mapping the controls to specific sequence numbers. However, Watters discloses in col. 11, lines 25-45 mapping controls to a sequence number in order to allow successful processing of control record data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of controls to sequence numbers in order to allow successful processing of control record data.

As per dependent claims 24, 43, and 62, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claims 24, 43, and 62 are similarly rejected.

7. Claims 6-7, 25-26, 44-45, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and Watters, and further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 6, 25, 44, and 63, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 6, 25, 44, and 63 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 7, 26, 45, and 64, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 7, 26, 45, and 64 are similarly rejected.

8. Claims 8, 27, 46, and 65 ^{do remain} ~~are~~ rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Kwong et al. (USPN 6,289,506 B1—filing date 6/30/1998).

As per dependent claim 8, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Mack fails to specifically disclose mapping the controls to specific sequence numbers. However, Kwong discloses in col. 4, lines 5-25 mapping the applet to a specific sequence number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of applets to sequence numbers in order to control execution order of Java directives to optimize performance.

As per dependent claim 27, 46, and 65, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8. Claims 27, 46, and 65 are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

9. Claims 9-10, 28-29, 47-48, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Kwong, further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 9, 28, 47, and 66, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 9, 28, 47, and 66 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 10, 29, 48, and 67, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 10, 29, 48, and 67 are similarly rejected.

10. Claim 17, 36, 55, and 74 ^{also remain} ~~are~~ rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Orbanes et al. (USPAP 2002/0075311 A1—filing date 2/14/2001).

As per dependent claim 17, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose providing one or more model view for a user to select from, wherein one or more selected model views correspond to the Cartesian coordinate-based view. However, Orbanes discloses providing a Cartesian coordinate-based model view in order to provide a virtual perspective on the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide model views in order to provide a virtual perspective on the system.

As per dependent claims 36, 55, and 74, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claims 36, 55, and 74 are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

11. Claims 18-19, 37-38, 56-57 and 75-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Obrnaes, and further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 18, 37, 56, and 75, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 18, 37, 56, and 75 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 19, 38, 57, and 76, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 19, 38, 57, and 76 are similarly rejected.

~~238 REMAINS~~
12. Claim 77 ~~is~~ rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack and Adobe and further in view of "XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0" (16 November 1999; w3c.org, hereafter XSL).

As per dependent claim 77, Mack and Adobe disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-based template. However, XSL discloses associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-based template (sections 1 and 5.4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe with XSL, since it would have allowed a user to process and format tag-based data (XSL: section 1).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 2 March 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's first argument is that the prior art fails to teach "selecting a tag field-based view comprising one or more applets (page 14)." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Mack teaches applets embedded in a tag based markup language (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024). Mack fails to specifically disclose selecting a tag field-based view of the markup language. However, as the examiner clearly states, Adobe discloses selection of a tag-based view for displaying HTML, a tag based markup language (page 62). The combination of Mack's use of a tag based markup language having embedded applets with Adobe's ability to display a tag-based view of markup language documents would allow a user to directly edit the tag data of a tag based markup language having embedded applets. This combination meets the applicant's claim language and is therefore not persuasive.

The applicant's second argument is based upon the applicant's belief that the examiner is providing two distinct definitions of tag field-based view (page 15). The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner relies upon Adobe to disclose adding graphical buttons to a web page (pages 306-307). Further, the applicant's claim language states "modifying the Cartesian view control (claim 1, line 13)." These buttons, which are added in Cartesian (graphical) view, have the corresponding tag based data added to the web page. When viewed in tag field-based view, the tagged

data corresponding to the button added in Cartesian view is shown. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

The applicant's third argument (page 16) is substantially similar to the first argument in that it is based upon the belief that the prior art of record fails to teach selecting a tag based-field view. However, as disclosed above, Adobe discloses this limitation, and the argument is not persuasive.

The applicant's fourth argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to teach migration to the selected tag field-based view from a Cartesian coordinate-based view (page 16). The applicant bases this argument on the belief that the prior art fails to provide the "identifying" and "associating" steps of claim 1 (lines 5-9). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Mack discloses both the "identifying" and "associating" steps of claim 1 (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024). Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

The applicant's fifth argument (page 18) is substantially similar to the applicant's second argument. This argument is similarly not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (pages 19, 25, and 27), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Mack's method of converting applets to tag-based views with Adobe's method of adding control buttons to a tag-based view, since it would have allowed a user to interact with the tag-based data (Adobe: page 306).

It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe, since it would have allowed a user to directly edit HTML source code (Adobe: page 62).

Finally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hall with Mack, since it would have allowed a user easily embed applet code within a tag based-field document (Hall: page 275).

With respect to the combination involving Watters, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of controls to sequence numbers in order to allow successful processing of control record data.

With respect to the combination involving Kwong, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use mapping of applets to sequence numbers in order to control execution order of Java directives to optimize performance.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning (page 21), it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

Art Unit: 2178

reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

kr


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER